SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

| | The transfer of the telephone of the folding | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|--|---|--|--|
| I. (a) PLAINTIFFS | | | DEFENDANTS | | | |
| SHIRLEY A. BRITTON | | | NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC | | | |
| (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff | | | County of Residence o | f First Listed Defendant | | |
| (c) Attorney's (Firm Na | une, Address, Telephone Number and Email Ac | idress) | į | | | |
| Craig Thor Kimmel, Esquire | | | NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. | | | |
| Kimmel & Silverman, | | | | | | |
| 30 E. Butler Pike | | | Attorneys (If Known) | | | |
| Ambler, PA 19002 | | | | | | |
| (215) 540-8888 | | | | | | |
| II. BASIS OF JURISI | DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) | III. C | ITIZENSHIP OF P | RINCIPAL PARTIES | (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff | |
| □ 1 U.S. Government | 25 3 Federal Question | | (For Diversity Cases Only) | TF DEF | and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF | |
| Plaintiff | (U.S. Government Not a Party) | Citiz | on of This State | | incipal Place O 4 O 4 | |
| ☐ 2 U.S. Government | O 4 Diversity | Citiz | zn of Another State | 2 O 2 Incorporated and I | Principal Place ① 5 ② 5 | |
| Defendant | (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) | | | of Business In A | | |
| | , | | en or Subject of a O | 3 D 3 Foreign Nation | 0606 | |
| IV. NATURE OF SUI | T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) | T. FU | neigh Country | | | |
| CONTRACT | TORTS | anini Tap | ORFEITURE/PENALTY | BANKRUPTCY | OTHER STATUTES | |
| 🗇 110 Insurance | PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJU | - 1 | 10 Agriculture | © 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 | O 400 State Reapportionment | |
| 120 Marine | 310 Airplane 3 362 Personal Injur | | 20 Other Food & Drug | ☐ 423 Withdrawal | ☐ 410 Antitrust | |
| ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument | 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpract Liability | | 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 | 28 USC 157 | O 430 Banks and Banking O 450 Commerce | |
| 150 Recovery of Overpayment | 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability | ity 🖊 🗗 63 | 30 Liquor Laws | PROPERTY RIGHTS | | |
| & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act | | | 40 R.R. & Truck | 820 Copyrights | 3 470 Racketeer Influenced and | |
| 152 Recovery of Defaulted | 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product Liability Liability | | 50 Airline Regs. 60 Occupational | S30 Patent 840 Trademark | Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit | |
| Student Loans | ☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPE | RTY | Safety/Health | | ☐ 490 Cabte/Sat TV | |
| (Excl. Veterans) © 153 Recovery of Overpayment | ☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud Liability ☐ 371 Truth in Lendis | | 90 Other LABOR | SOCIAL SECURITY | B10 Selective Service B50 Securities/Commodities/ | |
| of Veteran's Benefits | ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Personal | .s | 10 Fair Labor Standards | ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) | Exchange | |
| ☐ 160 Stockholders* Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract | ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Dama Product Liability ☐ 385 Property Dama | | Act | © 862 Black Lung (923) | 3 875 Customer Challenge | |
| 195 Contract Product Liability | 360 Other Personal Product Liabili | | 20 Labor/Mgmt, Relations 30 Labor/Mgmt,Reporting | ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI | 12 USC 3410 3 890 Other Statutory Actions | |
| ☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY | Injury | | & Disclosure Act | ☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) | 891 Agricultural Acts | |
| ID 210 Land Condemnation | CIVILITIGHTS PRISONER PETUTION 441 Voting | | 40 Railway Labor Act 90 Other Labor Litigation | SFEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff | 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters | |
| (7 220 Foreclosure | ☐ 442 Employment Sentence | | 91 Empl. Ret. Inc. | or Defendant) | 894 Energy Allocation Act | |
| 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land | 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus: | | Security Act | O 871 IRS—Third Party | 895 Freedom of Information | |
| 245 Tort Product Liability | Accommodations | 2500 | IMMIGRATION | 26 USC 7609 | Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination | |
| CJ 290 All Other Real Property | 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 3 540 Mandamus & 0 | Other 🗇 40 | 52 Naturalization Application | | Under Equal Access | |
| | Employment 550 Civil Rights 446 Amer, w/Disabilities - 555 Prison Condition | | 63 Habeas Corpus • Alien Detaince | | to Justice 950 Constitutionality of | |
| | Other | | 65 Other Immigration | | State Statutes | |
| | 440 Other Civil Rights | | Actions | | | |
| V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) State Court Appeal to District Appeal to District Appeal to District Appeal to District Recovered Recovered Recovered Appeal to District Appeal to Distric | | | | | | |
| r rocceding Si | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | (specif | | Judgment | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTI | ON Brief description of cause: | | | | H | |
| III NOOLOGGED IN | Fair Debt Collection Practices | | | | | |
| VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMANDS CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: | | | | | • | |
| COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 / JURY DEMAND: Ø Yes O No | | | | | | |
| VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER | | | | | | |
| Cuntanger | | | #_ | | | |
| Explanation: U/U/L1 | | , | // \ | | | |
| DATE | | / On | Avenu on no see | | | |
| DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD | | | | | | |

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

| Shirley A. Brit | Hon : | CIVIL ACTION | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----|--|--|--|--|
| v. | : | | | | | | |
| NCO Financial S | iystems Inc. | NO. | | | | | |
| In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned. | | | | | | | |
| SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS: | | | | | | | |
| (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. | | | | | | | |
| (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. () | | | | | | | |
| (c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. () | | | | | | | |
| (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. | | | | | | | |
| (e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) () | | | | | | | |
| (f) Standard Management - | Cases that do not fall into as | ny one of the other tracks. | (X) | | | | |
| 4 4 11 Date 215-540-8888 | Craig Than Kimm Athorney-at-law 877-788-2864 | Shirley A. Britte Attorneytor Kimmel @ creditla | • | | | | |
| Telephone | FAX Number | E-Mail Address | , | | | | |

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

| FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar. | used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Address of Plaintiff: Route 1, Box 148, Hamsville WV 26362 | | | | | | |
| Address of Defendant: 507 Prodential Road, Horsham, PA 19044 | | | | | | |
| Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: | | | | | | |
| (Usc Reverse Side For Additional Space) | | | | | | |
| Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and | | | | | | |
| (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) | Yes□ No□ | | | | | |
| Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? | YesG No C | | | | | |
| RELATED CASE, IF ANY: | | | | | | |
| Case Number: Judge | Date TermInated: | | | | | |
| Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: | | | | | | |
| 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year | _/ | | | | | |
| 2. Does this case involve the same Issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior sui action in this court? | Yes□ No LY t pending or within one year previously terminated | | | | | |
| | Yes No No | | | | | |
| ${\bf 3. \ \ Does \ this \ case \ involve \ the \ validity \ or \ infringement \ of \ a \ patent \ already \ In \ suit \ or \ any \ carller \ nur \ or \ and \ or \ o$ | | | | | | |
| terminated action in this court? | Yes No No | | | | | |
| 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights | case filed by the same Individual? | | | | | |
| | Yes No D | | | | | |
| CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) | | | | | | |
| A. Federal Question Cases: | B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases; | | | | | |
| 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts | 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts | | | | | |
| 2. □ FELA | 2. D Airplane Personal Injury | | | | | |
| 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury | 3. ☐ Assault, Defamation | | | | | |
| 4. Antitrust | □ Marine Personal Injury | | | | | |
| 5. □ Patent | 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury | | | | | |
| 6. ☐ Labor-Management Relations | □ Other Personal Injury (Please | | | | | |
| | specify) | | | | | |
| 7. □ Civil Rights | Products Liability | | | | | |
| 8. ☐ Habeas Corpus | 8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos | | | | | |
| 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases | 9. ☐ All other Diversity Cases | | | | | |
| 10. □ Social Security Review Cases | (Please specify) | | | | | |
| II. All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. 1492 (Please specify) | | | | | | |
| ARBITRATION CERTII | FICATION | | | | | |
| I. Craig That Kimmel counsel of record do hereby certify: | | | | | | |
| Purshari to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be | elief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of | | | | | |
| \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; | _ | | | | | |
| Relief other than monetary damages is sought. | | | | | | |
| DATE: 41411 Craig That Kimme | 57100 | | | | | |
| Attorney-at-Law | Attorney I.D.# | | | | | |
| NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by Jury only if there | nas been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. | | | | | |
| I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or we except as noted above. | ithin one year previously terminated action in this court | | | | | |
| DATE: 4/4/11 Crain Timer Kimmed | 571m | | | | | |
| Attorney-al-Law | Attorney (D.# | | | | | |

CIV. 609 (6/08)

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 SHIRLEY A. BRITTON, 4 Plaintiff 5 Case No.: v. 6 COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR 7 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., JURY TRIAL 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 COMPLAINT 10 SHIRLEY A. BRITTON ("Plaintiff"), by her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, 11 12 P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"): 13 INTRODUCTION 14 1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"). 16 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 17 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 18 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 19 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 20 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 21 Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of 3. 22 Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established. 23 24 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

25

5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

I

4 5

 PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Harrisville, West Virginia, 26362.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

 See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any

person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

15. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff.

- 16. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. Beginning on or around June 2010, Defendant, its agents, employees, and servants, continuously and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff on her home telephone seeking and demanding payment for an alleged consumer debt.
- 18. In addition, Defendant left repeated messages on Plaintiff's answering machine in its attempts to collect a debt.
- 19. Defendant called Plaintiff on her home telephone almost every day causing Plaintiff to receive, on average, more than ten (10) collection calls a week, and at times, more than twenty (20) calls a month.
- 20. In fact, on at least one occasion, Defendant called Plaintiff at least four (4) times on her home telephone in one day.
- When Plaintiff did speak with Defendant, she informed Defendant that she was unable to pay the amount demanded, explaining that she had recently had heart tests performed and needed to pay her medical bills.
- 22. Defendant's representative ridiculed Plaintiff for paying her medical bills, demanding that she pay her debt to Defendant.
- 23. Plaintiff terminated the telephone call, and thereafter, Plaintiff contacted Defendant to speak with a supervisor.
- 24. Plaintiff apprised the supervisor of her upsetting conversation with Defendant's representative; however, the supervisor too made insensitive and demeaning remarks about Plaintiff's medical condition, which served no other purpose but to harass, embarrass and upset Plaintiff.

 25. Within five (5) days of its initial conversation with Plaintiff, Defendant did not sent Plaintiff written correspondence notifying of her rights to dispute the debt and/or request verification of the debt.

- 26. To date, Plaintiff has not received any correspondence from Defendant notifying her of her rights to dispute the debt and/or request verification of the debt.
- 27. Upon information and belief, Defendant sought to collect a debt from Plaintiff despite the fact that it had no knowledge of its validity.
- 28. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were harassing, abusive and highly deceptive.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- 29. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin. Landry. deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 30. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act ("TILA") 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be

construed liberally in favor of the consumer." <u>Johnson v. Riddle</u>, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

31. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 32. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
 - c. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused the Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;

- d. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a debt;
- e. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- f. Defendant violated §1692g of the FDCPA by failing to send written notification, within five (5) days after its initial communication with Plaintiff, advising Plaintiff of her rights to dispute the debt or request verification of the debt; and
- g. Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, SHIRLEY A. BRITTON, respectfully pray for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

3 4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, SHIRLEY A. BRITTON, demands a jury trial

in this case.

DATED: 4/4/11

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL\& SILVERMAN, P.C.

By:

Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney ID # 57100

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C. 30 E. Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com